



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

PS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,627	03/30/2001	Lakshmi Balaji	10010891-1	7115

7590 07/12/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
WOZNIAK, JAMES S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/822,627	BALAJI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James S. Wozniak	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 11/22/2004, the applicant has submitted an amendment, filed 2/21/2005, amending Claims 1, 12, and 19-23, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the limitation regarding a localized string uniquely defined by string and language identifiers (*Amendment, Pages 9-10*). Applicant's arguments have been fully considered, however the previous rejection is maintained, altered only with respect to the amended claims and due to the reasons listed below in the response to arguments.
2. Based on the amendments to Claims 12 and 19-23, the examiner has withdrawn the previous objections directed towards a lack of proper antecedent basis.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

With respect to **Claim 1**, the applicant argues that “Internationalizing the Sample Program” fails to teach that a localized string for displaying text is uniquely defined by string and language identifiers (*Amendment, Pages 9-10*). The examiner notes that “Internationalizing the Sample Program” discloses that a particular text string is uniquely defined within a resource

bundle according to a language identifier, which identifies a language and locale, and a string identifier (Pages 1-2).

As shown in Section 1, Page 1, a greetings string in French (“Bonjour”) is uniquely defined by a French language code and a “greetings” string identifier. In this example, the combination of the two identifiers used to define a French greeting is not the same as the identifiers used to define an English greeting (“Hello”), and thus, is unique. Therefore, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches that a localized string is uniquely defined by a string and language identifier and claim 1 remains rejected.

With respect to Claims 12 and 21-23, see the response to arguments directed towards claim 1.

The dependent claims further limit rejected independent claims, and thus, also remain rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. **Claims 1-4, 7, 9, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by (*“Internationalizing the Sample Program,” Anonymous, version from 10/3/1999.*)

With respect to **Claim 1**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

A file having text for displaying in multiple languages (*translatable text, Page 1, Section 1, and Page 2, Section 3*);

A string identifier for uniquely identifying each text in said file (*properties file containing translatable text, Page 1, Section 1*);

A language identifier for uniquely identifying each language available for said file (*Page 2, Section 2*);

A localized string for displaying text uniquely defined by said string identifier and said language identifier (*Page 1- Page 2, Section 3*);

A message catalog for storing a plurality of said localized strings (*resource bundle objects, Page 2, Section 3*); and,

A localized string retrieval function for retrieving said localized string according to said string identifier and said language identifier from said message catalog (*fetching text for display, Page 3, Section 4*).

With respect to **Claim 2**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

Localized string retrieval function retrieves said localized string according to said string identifier and said language identifier from said message catalog for each text in said file (*fetching translated text messages, Page 3, Section 4*).

With respect to **Claim 3**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

Localized string retrieval function retrieves said localized string responsive to a request for said file (*fetching a translated text message in response to a getString request command, Page 3, Section 4*).

With respect to **Claim 4**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

The message catalog includes a default language (*translated text having an English default version, Page 1, Section 1*).

With respect to **Claim 7**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

The file, the message catalog, and the localized string retrieval function are stored as a single application (*properties file java program, Pages 1-3*).

With respect to **Claim 9**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

The localized string retrieval function is stored in said file (*getString command stored within a properties file, Page 3, Section 4*).

With respect to **Claims 12 and 21**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

Requesting a file in a specified language by the user (*user invoking a getBundle and getString command to fetch a translated message, Pages 2- 3, Sections 3-4*);

Identifying the specified language (*locale data, Page 2, Sections 2 and 3*);

Contacting the message catalog with the string identifier and the specified language (*getBundle routine used to retrieve a message in a language specified by locale information, Page 2, Section 3*); and

Returning the localized string uniquely designated by the string identifier and specified language (*fetching text for display, Page 3, Section 4; Pages 1-2*).

With respect to **Claim 13**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

Displaying the localized string to the user (*fetching text for display, Page 3, Section 4*).

With respect to **Claim 15**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses:

Specifying a language by the user (*specifying a locale in a getBundle command, Page 2, Section 3*).

With respect to **Claim 16**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program,” discloses: Executing a get language identifier function; and obtaining a language identifier from the get language identifier function (*getBundle command including a locale argument, Page 2, Section 3*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 5, 6, 22, and 23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Internationalizing the Sample Program” in view of Yamamoto et al (U.S. Patent: 6,311,151).

With respect to **Claims 5 and 6**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches the translation system utilizing translatable text strings, locale identifiers, and text fetching routines, as applied to Claim 1. The aforementioned reference does not specifically suggest storing the text messages, locale identifiers, and fetching routines on a single storage medium, wherein the medium is a ROM and the program is hard-coded to the medium (firmware), however Yamamoto discloses such a medium for use in a text localization application (Col. 8, Lines 21-23).

“Internationalizing the Sample Program” and Yamamoto are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in language text translation systems. Thus, it would have

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with the use of a ROM in a text translation application as taught by Yamamoto to prevent a file containing translated text from being altered by an unauthorized user (*i.e. not a translator or programmer*), thus maintaining localized file integrity.

With respect to **Claims 22 and 23**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches the translation system utilizing translatable text strings, locale identifiers, and text fetching routines, as applied to Claim 12. The aforementioned reference does not specifically suggest method storage on a computer readable medium, however, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to store the text translation method taught by “Internationalizing the Sample Program” on the computer readable medium taught by Yamamoto with respect to Claim 5, to increase method compatibility and usability by providing a means for method use with multiple computer systems.

8. **Claims 8, 10, 11, and 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Internationalizing the Sample Program” in view of Schultz et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,453,339, U.S. Patent of WO 00/43917*).

With respect to **Claim 8**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches the translation system utilizing translatable text strings, locale identifiers, and text fetching routines, as applied to Claim 1. “Internationalizing the Sample Program” does not specifically suggest storing translation means on a web server, however, storing translation files on a web server is

well known in the text translation art as is evidenced by Schultz (*content server, Col. 15, Lines 56- Col. 16, Line 16*).

“Internationalizing the Sample Program” and Schultz are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in Java-based text translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with the use of a server for storing translation files as taught by Schultz in order to implement a means of distributing translated text files to multiple terminals and conserving system memory at a local device since all translation data is stored on a server.

With respect to **Claim 10**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches the translation system utilizing translatable text strings, locale identifiers, and text fetching routines, as applied to Claim 1. “Internationalizing the Sample Program” does not specifically suggest the use of an HTML file format, however, such a file format is well known in the art for use with Java based text translation as is evidenced by Schultz (*Col. 15, Line 18- Col. 16, Line 16*).

“Internationalizing the Sample Program” and Schultz are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in Java-based text translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with the use of an HTML file format for a translation file as taught by Schultz in order to provide a translation of a well-known HTML file format, commonly utilized in user interface screens (Schultz, Col. 15, Lines 18-22).

With respect to **Claim 11**, Schultz teaches the HTML file format as applied to Claim 10, while “Internationalizing the Sample Program” further discloses:

Localized string retrieval function is C code (*getString java routine, which is a form of C based coding, Page 3, Section 4*).

With respect to **Claim 17**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches the translation system utilizing translatable text strings, locale identifiers, and text fetching routines, as applied to Claim 12. “Internationalizing the Sample Program” does not specifically suggest determining whether a device supports a message catalog and returning to a default if the catalog is not supported, however Schultz recites:

Determining whether the device supports the message catalog; and, returning a default language of the message catalog when the message catalog is not supported (*default English string utilized when a properties file is not supported by a system, Col. 16, Lines 5-40*).

“Internationalizing the Sample Program” and Schultz are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in Java-based text translation systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with the use of a default language file if a properties file is not supported by a translation device as taught by Schultz in order to overcome method compatibility limitations by providing a means of uniformly presenting internet data even if a message format is not supported by a translation system (*Schultz, Col. 1, Lines 40-43*).

With respect to **Claim 18**, Schultz additionally recites:

Determining whether the user has specified the language (*looking for language and country data, Col. 16, Lines 5-40*);

Returning the user specified language when the user specifies a language (*taught by “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with respect to Claim 12*); and

Returning a default language of the message catalog when the user does not specify a language (*default English strings, Col. 16, Lines 5-40*).

With respect to **Claim 19**, Schultz further discloses:

Determining whether there is a default language of the device (*determining the presence of a properties file specifying a language, Col. 16, Lines 5-16*);

Returning the specified language when there is a default language of the computing device (*taught by “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with respect to Claim 12*); and

Returning a default language of the message catalog when there is no default language of the computer device (*defaulting to a common properties file if a properties file is not present, Col. 16, Lines 5-40*).

9. **Claims 14 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “Internationalizing the Sample Program.”

With respect to **Claim 14**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches the translation system utilizing translatable text strings, locale identifiers, and text fetching routines, as applied to Claim 12. Although “Internationalizing the Sample Program” does not specifically suggest returning a string length indicator for a localized string, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known in the art to return an indicator of text string length to a display processor so that text can be preprocessed and formatted prior to display. Therefore, in order to provide necessary formatting information for display, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with a means of returning a text string length.

With respect to **Claim 20**, “Internationalizing the Sample Program” teaches the translation system utilizing translatable text strings, locale identifiers, and text fetching routines, as applied to Claim 12. Although “Internationalizing the Sample Program” does not specifically suggest the use of a character set identifier, the examiner takes official notice that character set identifiers are well known in the art for use in text display applications in order to allow a user to configure a text display preference or display special characters such as Japanese kanji. Therefore, in order to display text according to user preference or special language characters, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of “Internationalizing the Sample Program” with the use of a character set identifier.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2655

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632 and email is James.Wozniak@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays, 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached at (571) 272-7582. The fax/phone number for the Technology Center 2600 where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

James S. Wozniak
6/14/2005



W. R. YOUNG
PRIMARY EXAMINER